

Claim 1 specifically recites:

"said device being capable of memorizing N items, N being a natural integer, ... a first memory adapted to memorize a maximum of M items that were last presented to said device, M being a natural integer less than N, a second memory adapted to memorize N-M second items, each of said N-M items being different from each of said M items" (emphasis added).

It is clear that Claim 1 requires that the first and second memories contain no duplicated items.

Both the cited reference to Jouppi et al and the reference to Bryant et al relate to rapid access to information in a cache. Nowhere does either reference show or suggest two memories whose stored items are different from each other. For example, Jouppi et al specifically states, on page 44, left column, lines 2 and 3, that their arrangement provides "*less duplication* between the contents of the first and second level cache". It is therefore clear that Jouppi et al has *duplication* of information in their memories, and therefore does not affect the patentability of Claim 1.

Similarly, Bryant et al. uses two memories: a cache and an active array. A least-recently-used algorithm determines a transfer of data or instructions from the active array to the cache, and which data or instructions are to be deleted from the cache to make room for the data or instructions to be transferred to the cache from the active array. Bryant et al. uses the cache for temporary storage. Any data in the cache is also contained in the active array. It is therefore clear that Bryant et al., similar to Jouppi et al, neither shows nor suggests that each of the items in one memory are different from each of the items in another memory.

Even if the disclosures of Jouppi et al and Bryant et al were to be combined, it is clear that the combination would not affect the patentability of Claim 1, since neither of the cited references show or suggest that each of the items in one memory is different from each of the items in another memory.

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498
Serial No.: 10/530,899
Final Office Action dated: 01/22/08
Response dated: 06/23/08

PATENT
PF020137

Claims 2 to 5 and 8 are dependent from Claim 1 and add further advantageous features. The Applicant submits that these sub-claims are patentable as their parent Claim 1.

Claim 6 is similar to Claim 1 in reciting:

"each of said N- M items being different from each of said M items".

It is therefore clear that the patentability of Claim 6 is not affected by the cited references to Jouppi et al and Bryant et al, taken either singly or in combination.

Claim 7 is dependent from Claim 6 and adds further advantageous features. The Applicant submits that Claim 7 is patentable as its parent Claim 6.

The Applicant therefore submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

ERIC DIEHL

By:


Daniel E. Sragow, Attorney
Reg. No. 22,856
(609) 734-6832

DES:pdf

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing LLC
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

June 23, 2008